

Minutes

November 10, 2015 Council Chambers – Lower Level 57 East 1st Street 4:30 PM

A work session of the Design Review Board was held at the City of Mesa Council Chamber – Lower Level, 57 East 1st Street at 4:30 p.m.

Board Members Present:

Brian Sandstrom – Chair Eric Paul Tracy Roedel Nicole Thompson Randy Carter

Board Members Absent:

Sean Banda Taylor Candland

Staff Present:

John Wesley
Tom Ellsworth
Jeff McVay
Andrew Spurgin
Wahid Alam
Kim Steadman
Kaelee Wilson
Mike Gildenstern

Others Present:

Reese Anderson Sake Reindersma Peter Phillips Richard Dwyer Rick Kern K. Missale S. Duclos Peter Phillips Doug Austin Jesse Perry Georgetta Hoffard Gordon Hoffard Larry Kern Adam Kogan Rod Booze Sterling Margetts

Chairperson Sandstrom welcomed everyone to the Work Session at 4:37 p.m.

A. <u>Discuss and Provide Direction Regarding Design Review cases:</u>

Item A.1. **DR15-036 Development of a new drive-thru restaurant**

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2210 West Southern Avenue

REQUEST: Review of a proposed retail and restaurant space

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3

OWNER: GDC San Jose & Southern, LLC, Garrett Development

Corporation

APPLICANT: RKAA

ARCHITECT: Neal Feaser STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

Staff Planner: Kim Steadman

Staff Recommendation: Continuance to the December 8, 2015 Meeting

Item A.2. DR15-039 Canyon Winds Assisted Living

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 2860 North Ridgecrest (NWC of McDowell Road and Ridgecrest

Street)

REQUEST: Review of a proposed assisted living facility.

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 5

OWNER: JCA Holdings LLC
APPLICANT: Pew and Lake PLC
ARCHITECT: Reese Anderson
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

Staff Planner: Kim Steadman

Discussion:

Staff member, Kim Steadman, presented the case to the Board.

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Stated that the materials used in the architecture fit well with the surrounding area
- Commented that the 4 story height seems out of place in the Desert Uplands Planning Area
- Proposed siting the building back into the landscaping along McDowell to soften the impact of the project

Boardmember Roedel:

- Felt that the planned 4 stories in height is out of place for the area
- Confirmed with the applicant that there are 216 units in the project
- Confirmed that neighborhood letters of notification were mailed at a radius of 1000'.
- Felt that the building should be setback, behind significant landscaping like the landscaping buffer already seen at Las Sendas to minimize the impact

Boardmember Paul:

 Confirmed with the applicant that through sight line studies commissioned in 2008, that no view would be blocked

Boardmember Carter:

- Confirmed with applicant that it was approved initially as a commercial center with a parking garage
- Confirmed with applicant that there will be roof-mounted air conditioning units
- Felt that the project was well-articulated, displaying nice varying color patterns, but suggested a larger roof to play off the mass of the building more appropriately
- Expressed his concern to Staff that he would like the Design Review Board to have another look at the building before it is finalized, as design aesthetic needs change as building masses and siting changes in the Site Plan Review process

Boardmember Thompson

- Confirmed with the applicant that there will be 9' ceilings
- Confirmed with the applicant that there hasn't been a traffic study completed for the project
- Confirmed with applicant that the citizen participation meeting had roughly 65 people in attendance, and the opinions regarding the project were mixed
- Proposed that covered parking be implemented with under-lighting, and be constructed with upgraded materials
- Was surprised that the proposed lighting fixtures are contemporary, and not Tuscan-like in design
- Liked the design of the project
- Confirmed with the applicant that the residential counts in the project will total roughly 275 people; 32 people in the memory care unit, adding 0 automobiles, 60 residents in assisted living, where roughly 10% of the residents own vehicles, and roughly 120 residents in the independent living units, where roughly half the residents own a vehicle.

Item A.3. DR15-040 Arizona General Hospital

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 9008 East Elliot Road (NWC of Elliot and Ellsworth Roads)

REQUEST: Review of a proposed medical center

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 6

OWNER: El Dorado Elliot 128 LLC

APPLICANT: PMRG II, LLC ARCHITECT: Peter Phillips STAFF PLANNER: Tom Ellsworth

Staff Planner: Tom Ellsworth

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Confirmed with the applicant that the mechanical units will be properly screened
- Did not like the appearance of the roof attached the central plant
- Would like to see some tie back to the primary building
- Would like to see a roof drain or scupper used to create a consistent elevation
- Confirmed with applicant that the side walls are constructed with split-face CMU, and proposed that 2 colors of block be used

Boardmember Carter:

- Confirmed with Staff that the Arizona General Hospital is within the boundaries of the Elliot Road Technology Corridor
- Confirmed with Staff that the parcels to the east are platted for Light Industrial Lots
- Felt that it was a great project, and other buildings along the Corridor should be held to similar standards

Boardmember Roedel:

- Confirmed with the applicant that there is not currently an approved site plan for the project
- Liked the building

Boardmember Thompson:

Liked the project

Item A.4. DR15-041 Lost Neon Sign Murals

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 147 West Main Street

REQUEST: Review of a proposed mural project depicting former Mesa neon

signs

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 4

OWNER: Surf and Ski Enterprises

APPLICANT: City of Mesa **STAFF PLANNER:** Jeff McVay

Discussion:

Cori Garcia from the Downtown Mesa Association and artist Jesse Kerry, presented the case to the Board.

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Liked the colors seen in the examples, appreciated the "watercolor-type" appearance, feeling that they are reminiscent of a sunset
- Would like to see more of the art installations located in better view from Main Street

Boardmember Carter:

• Liked the example of The Marquee Drive-In that prominently featured the large chicken

Boardmember Paul:

- Confirmed with the applicant that the artists will fit the murals into the voids using an appropriate aspect ratio
- Liked the color palette used in the examples, saw it as just a splash of color, and not a full-scale rebranding of Downtown Mesa

Boardmember Thompson:

- Confirmed with the applicant that there will be an informational component to the murals which will place them into a historical context
- Confirmed that the murals will last at least 10 years when located in a shaded area
- Confirmed that any damage done to the murals will be corrected by the artist
- Confirmed with the applicant that all the murals are based off of businesses once located in Mesa
- Felt that the murals should just focus on one sign and not the multiple signs depicted in some of the murals
- Concerned that the color palette seen in the murals are more in line with the Fiesta District, and that a different set of colors should be used Downtown

DR15-042 Signal Butte RV and Mini Storage Item A.5.

NEC of Guadalupe and Signal Butte Roads LOCATION/ADDRESS:

Review of a proposed two story RV and mini-storage facility **REQUEST:**

COUNCIL DISTRICT:

OWNER: Mesa Centerpointe Plaza Mesa Centerpointe Plaza APPLICANT:

STAFF PLANNER: Wahid Alam

<u>Staff Planner</u>: Kim Steadman <u>Staff Recommendation</u>: Continuance to the December 8, 2015 Meeting

Item A.6. DR15-043 Fiesta Salad and Go

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1040 West Southern Avenue

REQUEST: Review of a proposed drive-thru restaurant

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3

OWNER: Chris Hinkson APPLICANT: SRA 360

ARCHITECT: Sake Reindersma STAFF PLANNER: Wahid Alam, AICP

Staff Planner: Wahid Alam, AICP

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed drive-thru restaurant:

- Would like to see the architecture play off of the office buildings in the area, specifically the incorporation of finished tiles instead of stucco
- Wanted to see more varying material

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Would like to see the building closer to the street
- Would like to see more creativity in the design
- Liked the design a lot better than what was proposed initially at other locations
- Proposed dress up the columns, possibly using brick
- Liked the sleek modern relevance of the design, but would like to see more design features
 in the architecture

Boardmember Thompson:

- Was concerned that the site-plan was not feasible after rearranging the drive-thru
- Felt that the drive-thru would get in the way of pedestrian access when located towards the street
- Felt that the overhang is too thin
- Pointed to Longhorn Steakhouse as an example of good architecture in the Fiesta District

Boardmember Carter:

- Proposed flipping the siteplan180 degrees
- Concerned that the proportions of the architecture create a severe-looking building
- Would like to see the building more relevant to the area that it is located in,
- Would like to see more of the reds, yellows, and blues found in the Fiesta District
- Proposed designing the building to complement the other buildings in the area (specifically the bank and the offices on the south side of Southern)
- Didn't like the severe square top
- Proposed using wainscoting and brick to match surrounding and to create a more playful building
- Proposed using splayed walls, lighter greys and tans, and using reveals at a 45 degree angle in the architecture, to make it more visually appealing
- Would like to see something more than just a corporate symbol placed at the site

• Wanted to see more architectural lyricism, and some movement in the design

Boardmember Paul:

- Interpreted that the retention would have to be move to allow for a drive-thru
- Proposed bring more playfulness to the planes
- Pointed to Panda Express at Stapley and Southern as an example of artistic elements that tie in to architecture

Item A.6. DR15-025 Rosemont Office Warehouses

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1715, 1737, 1759 North Rosemont

REQUEST: Review of a proposed warehouse building.

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 5

OWNER: Mark Reeb, Ranchland Holdings II LLC

APPLICANT: Hitchens Architecture

ARCHITECT: Greg Hitchens STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

Staff Planner: Kim Steadman

Staff Recommendation: Continuance to the December 8, 2015 Work Session

B. Call to Order

Chairperson Sandstrom called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

C. Consider the Minutes from the October 13, 2015 meeting

On a motion by Boardmember Carter, seconded by Boardmember Paul, the Board unanimously approved the October 13, 2015 minutes. Vote-(approved 5-0) (Absent: Boardmember Banda and Candland)

- D. Discuss and take action on the following Design Review cases:
- E. Other Business

Item E.1. Discussion of Residential Small Lot Product

Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Suggested crafting something like the City of Chandler uses for small lot product, set of design guidelines
- Felt that the small lot product should be reviewed if the project totals a specific minimum acreage (5 acres?)

Boardmember Thompson:

Felt that small lot product should be held to a more strict set of guidelines

Boardmember Carter:

- Suggested that all residential product should come to the Design Review Board for approval, as well as reviewing the site plan
- Proposed more stringent guidelines for small-lot product

- F. Other Business
- G.

Adjournment The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Gildenstern Planning Assistant

mg